

4

O B S E R V A T I O N S

ON THE

LETTERS OF LORD FITZW——M

TO

LORD CARLISLE,

(REPRINTED FROM THE DUBLIN JOURNAL)

WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DUBLIN CATHOLICS,

ON

THE 23^d OF DECEMBER, 1794

THE

ADDRESSES OF THE CATHOLICS

OF

DUBLIN AND WESTMEATH.

HIS

LORDSHIPS ANSWERS;

AND THE

OATH OF A PRIVY-COUNS——R

ANNEXED.

D U B L I N:

PRINTED BY THOMAS BURNSIDE,

AND SOLD

AT No. 15, PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1795.



OBSERVATIONS, &c.

LORD F——M having distributed to a variety of his friends, copies of two Letters he had written to Lord C——E in vindication of his conduct, Mr. *H. Fitzpatrick*, Printer to the Catholic Committee, has thought proper to publish them. Such a measure ought surely to have been left to his Lordship's enemies.

His Lordship first supposes all his dismissals and measures (but particularly his conduct on the Catholic question) to be the grounds of his recall: He then asserts that the Catholic question has nothing to do with it, and that the dismissal of Mr. B——D alone is the real cause of his disgrace: Lastly, he rejects those grounds altogether, and ascribes his removal to an original determination in Mr. P——T, at the time of the coalition, to discredit him and his friends. It is a proof of weakness to shift the ground of defence; but it is a still greater proof of weak-

A

ness

ness to fly from facts to insinuation, from argument to personality.

Lord F———M seems to have omitted no possible mode of defence, since he has even revealed the secrets of his Sovereign, and disclosed the confidential correspondence of the Cabinet. Had such a disclosure justified his Lordship, it would even then be difficult to excuse it; but as it palpably condemns him, he is in every light unpardonable.

This breach of official confidence is made for the purpose of shewing that he acted from authority in his conduct on the Catholic question, and that it was not the cause of his recall. Let us examine his Lordship's proofs:

He first mentions that he had proposed in Cabinet, "that additional indulgences to the Catholics should be offered from the Throne; but that to this proposal objections were stated that appeared of sufficient weight to induce the adoption of another plan." He then states, that "he consented not to bring forward the subject on the part of the Government, but rather to endeavour to keep it back until a period of more general tranquillity, when so many material objects might not press upon Government.

Thus

Thus it appears that Lord F——M was instructed to keep the Catholic question back till a Peace, and that he had consented to do so if possible. Yet at the very period of his making this engagement with the Cabinet, his own confidential Minister, Mr. G——N, was bringing the Catholics forward, and teaching them to petition for a repeal of every restrictive law, from every parish in the kingdom. On his Lordship's arrival on the 14th of January, he finds that "the Catholic petitions to Parliament were prepared, but that he was happy the business was in the hands of Mr. G——N;" nevertheless he writes on the 8th to the Cabinet, that he would obey their instructions, and "use what efforts he could to stop the progress of it."

Every man in Ireland knew early in December, that Mr. G——N was to be Lord F——M's Minister: Every man knew that about the 15th of December he had meetings with Mr. BYRNE and others of the Catholic Committee, wherein it was settled that the Catholic Body should come forward with Petitions to Parliament; and every man had read the Proceedings of the Catholics of Dublin on the 23d of December, wherein it is resolved to demand the repeal of ALL restrictive Laws whatsoever.

Was Mr. G——N, (as Minister to Lord F——w——M), authorised to bring the Catholics forward? If he was, Lord F——M is convicted on his own statement: If he acted without authority, did Lord F——M disavow him? And if he did not, with what sincerity did his Lordship write on the 8th of January, that “ he would use every effort to keep the question “ back?” And on what pretence could he say, that “ he was happy to find the question in the “ hands of Mr. G——N,” who had thus committed him without his authority, and against his instructions?

But Lord F——M must have surely known what passed in Ireland previous to his leaving London; for Mr. G——N saw Mr. BYRNE, and settled every proceeding with him about the 15th of December, and he could hardly have failed communicating the steps he had taken to Lord FITZWILLIAM, to whom he was Minister: So that Lord F——M must have known what had passed in Ireland before he left London, which was not till the last day of the year.

As to the idea of Lord F——M “ giving “ a handsome support to the measure if it “ could not be kept back:” this admission is no excuse whatsoever, if he used no efforts to do so; and can merely be construed, that he

was

was to support the measure if it could not be resisted, after every effort made.

How then does the fact stand? The actual bringing forward of the question was the work of Lord F———M's Minister: This Minister was not disavowed. When Lord F———M received the Address of the Catholics, he gave the most encouraging Answer to their hopes, and the most decided approbation of his Minister. It will be allowed that these were *efforts*, but they were efforts not to delay, but to urge on the Catholic claims; they were all contrary to the tenor of his instructions; nor does his Lordship attempt to produce one single exertion which he made in compliance with them.

The dispatch of the 8th of January has been mentioned, wherein his Lordship states, "that he should immediately use every effort to keep back the Catholic question." The Cabinet of course conceived that his Lordship was sincere and determined; they felt, perhaps, confident (and they had every reason to feel so) that if his Lordship exerted himself according to his promise, he would have been successful; and of course due credit is given to his Lordship, and no answer is returned to a letter which did not require one.

On

On the 15th of January his Excellency writes another dispatch, and states his answer to the Catholics, in which he conceived " he had " kept clear of all specific engagements," but " urges the grant of all the Catholics wished ;" and he gives notice, " that if he received no " very peremptory orders to the contrary, he " should acquiesce." He then, with apparent justice, complains that no answer was returned to him till the 8th of February. His Excellency omits stating, first, that his dispatch of the 15th of January (being delayed in Ireland by contrary winds) did not arrive in London until the 27th of January: and 2dly, that Lord M——n received a letter from a Cabinet Minister (Mr. W——m) on the 2d of Feb. " giving intimation of discontent among his " colleagues in England." Where is now his Lordship's ground of complaint? Five days after his dispatch of the 15th arrived in England, notice was sent that his *conduct gave discontent*; and on the 7th of February, a final Cabinet on that conduct is held, and positive orders are sent him on the 8th to adhere to the original instructions he had received, and which, from his letter of the 8th of January, it appears he fully understood; and his Lordship is acquitted, that his putting off the Catholic question until the peace, " may be of more " essential service than any act of any Minister " since

“since the Revolution, at least since the Union.” On receiving this dispatch, merely confining him to his first instructions and original engagements, does he make any effort to comply or obey? Does he call for the advice of the King’s servants? Does he apply to his friends for support? Does he endeavour to check the Catholics? So far from adopting such measures, he gives not himself a moment’s time to consider and deliberate: he answers the dispatch with precipitancy and passion, by return of the post, “expresses his surprise at being now pressed for “the first time,” (although it was his original engagement to do so) “to defer the question: “positively refuses to run the risk,” and, in the most violent language, declines “to be “the person” (so he is pleased to state) “to “raise a flame in the country, which nothing “short of arms could be able to keep down.” On the arrival of this letter, the Cabinet finding his Excellency resolved to resist their instructions, and not knowing what might be the consequence of his continuing in Ireland, (for Mr. G——N had on the 12th of February, moved for leave to bring in the Catholic Bill—had refused a Committee on the Catholic petitions—and declared he would pass the bill before the assizes), the Cabinet, I say, thus circumstanced, are reduced to a decisive measure, and on the 21st they recall him.

Can

Can any chain of evidence hang more completely together than the above statement? Yet his Lordship insists that the Catholic question did not enter into the causes of his dismissal; because, after the dispatch of the 8th of February enforcing delay the Duke of P—— enters upon the subject at length in his letters of the 16th and 18th of February: That is, his Grace not receiving Lord F——'s determination to decline the commands of the Cabinet, acts under the persuasion that his Lordship would obey them, till he is informed by Lord F——'s dispatch of the 15th that he positively will not, and then his Grace unavoidably concurs in his dismissal on the 21st.

It would be easy to detect many other inconsistencies in Lord F——'s statement, if necessary: for instance, in his first letter, he says, "If the only point referred for consideration was the time and manner; and if it was not implicitly left to his consideration to judge of the manner and time:" What is this, but saying that the time and manner were reserved, and at the same time were *not* reserved to the British Cabinet? If Lord F——zw—— was judge of the time and manner, those points were not reserved; and if they were reserved, he was no longer the judge of them.

But

But his Lordship's inconsistencies of statement are not the object of these Observations : they are made to prove, that *under his own shewing*, his recall was necessary. He was sent with instructions to keep back the Catholic question : after promising to do so, he countenances the person who brought it forward, continues him as his Minister, and having encouraged the Catholics in his answer, he orders that Minister to move their Bill in the House of Commons, to refuse a Committee on their petitions, to declare that he will pass this bill before the Assizes, and then being desired to delay the measure and adhere to his first instructions, he positively refuses altogether, and rejects the command of the Cabinet.

After such a direct and formal disavowal of the authority of his Majesty's Ministers, his continuance in Administration would have been a dissolution of the unity of the Government. He was therefore unanimously recalled, as his Lordship states from the Duke of P———'s dispatch, for " the preservation of the Empire."

If Lord F———M has not been fortunate in the justification of his conduct as to the Catholic question, he has been less happy on the subject of his dismissals. His Lordship quotes a Letter from Mr. PITT, in which his Lordship is charged " with having acted inconsistently with that prin-
B " ciple

“ ciple by which alone the full advantage of the
 “ union which had taken place in England could
 “ be extended to Ireland.” He thus tacitly admits
 his having adopted and acquiesced in this principle,
 and proceeds to vindicate his conduct as strictly conformable to it.

Adopting therefore, with his Lordship, this principle of union as a leading maxim of his Government, let us apply his conduct to the rule: the whole of his Government was mere party, of the most narrow and contracted kind; as to measures, confined to a very few, and as to patronage, to a single family—his Lordships cousins. There was not one old servant of the Crown in the real confidence of Government; and if two or three were occasionally consulted on specific points on which their assistance was absolutely necessary, scarce any of them escaped some mark of indifference or slight. In order to secure his Lordship steadfast to party views, he was encompassed with every flattering form and ceremony; was closely watched and guarded by partisans, and was secluded from any general intercourse with the leading characters of the kingdom: He submitted to draw all his informations and opinions from one set of men only—to them he became subservient in the most unexampled degree; hardly any gentleman was received with common civility that was not a friend of his connections; all the friends of the
 former

former Administration seemed upon that account to be set aside, and the old supporters of Government were in continual expectation of being removed for their attachment to the Crown. Party was carried to such an extreme, that it was avowed in Parliament, that the Administration intended to go back to the Regency, and overturn the arrangements which at that period were adopted.

Such is the unexaggerated picture of the line of conduct pursued by Lord F———M in compliance with the principle of Union on which he accepted the Government.

But let us attend to Lord F———M's pathetic Appeal: "Am I then (says his Lordship) so little known to my friends, that whilst I pretended the public good and the King's service, I am infidiously consulting my private interest; and instead of my country, have only my connections in view."

To judge of this Appeal, a few leading facts must be stated:

Mr. W. P———y was to be Secretary of	} £1,700
State for life, at	
Mr. G. P———y, to be Attorney-General	2,400
B 2	Mr.

Mr. C——N, a creature of Mr. P——N- s——Y's, as stated by Lord F——M,	} 2,000
Mr. L. M——s, a near friend of Mr. P——Y's, to be Under Secretary in the Civil Department,	
Total,	£.8,100

Such was the first Family arrangement for the good of the country. It was indeed natural and fair that Lord F——M should attend to the claims of his cousins with an honorable partiality: but to state that the removal of Mr. W——E to make way for Mr. G. P——Y, the removal of Mr. T——R to make way for Mr. C——N, and of Mr. H——N to accommodate Mr. M——s, were measures adopted merely for the public good and the KING's service, is rather extravagant.

Does his Lordship mean to assert that his threatening to dismiss Mr. W——E, if he would not accede to his terms of removal (one of the most upright servants a Monarch ever possessed, the first Lawyer at the Bar, a character of the greatest weight and dignity in Parliament, of tried consistency and consummate integrity) was a measure adopted merely for the public good and the King's service?

Does

Does his Lordship mean to assert that the bringing of a Judge to retire (against his will) by a pension of 300l. a year to his family, and 1200l a year to himself, in order to make Mr. C——N Solicitor General, and to force from his situation one of the oldest, ablest, most attached and most resolute of his MAJESTY'S servants, and the determination of palming such an odious measure upon the Parliament was merely for the public good and the King's service?

Does his Lordship mean to state that putting an addition to the Pension List of 1200l. a year, in order to get rid of Mr. H——N, who had served his Majesty for fifty years with ability, industry and integrity seldom equalled, and never excelled, in order to accommodate a Gentleman who never was in any habits of business at all, was solely for the public good and the King's service?

No—no: the King's service—public good never entered into these arrangements; they were alone dictated by Family considerations, unless another principle conjoined its influence—the scheme of forming an exclusive Party, and disgracing all the old servants of the Crown.

This

This principle accounts for the removal of Mr. C——E, who had been long employed under successive Governments, and whom his Lordship attacks for disrespect, because he rejected a provision by pension of less than 150l. a year, though his Lordship insinuates that he offered him 1200l.

Why does his Lordship suppress his adherence to the principle of union in the dismissal of Lord G——H from the Clerkship of the Hanaper, and his kind consolation to his Lordship, that he had been particularly recommended to him by Mr. P——T?

Why does his Lordship suppress his adherence to this principle in the affront he put on the C——R, when, without previous consultation, he sent him a list of eight King's Counsel to swear in, although the nomination to that rank is almost invariably left to the C——R's judgment?

But his adherence to the principle of union in the removal of Mr. B——D, is indeed conspicuous—dismissal, misrepresentation, defamation.

Indeed his Lordship's resentment to all the persons he removed is unaccountable, unless the

the proverb that we never forgive those we have injured, be allowed as an excuse.

However, as the removal of Mr. B———^d is made one of the leading causes of Lord F——z-w——m's recall, let us consider his Lordship's statement of the subject.

First, his Lordship states, that " he had mentioned to Mr. P———^{tt}, Mr. B———^d's dangerous power, and his apprehensions that he should be obliged to remove him, and that Mr. P———^{tt} did not offer the slightest objection or say a word in his favour."—2dly. He states, " that he submitted to the odium of leaving Mr. B———^d his full income, thro' fear of displeasing his colleagues by infringing the emolument of a person professing a great attachment to them, though indeed at the same time he had no slight ground of doubting the sincerity of those professions."—3dly, He says, " that for the person whom Mr. P———^{tt} contends so strenuously, he has no regard, and that he doubts whether he will permit him to resume his station at the Revenue Board." Thus does his Lordship state, that neither was Mr. B———^d attached to Mr. P———^{tt}, nor Mr. P———^{tt} to Mr. B———^d; and yet, that the *sole* cause of his own downfall was the dismissal of a man to whose removal Mr. P———^{tt} had stated no objection—for whom
he

he had no regard, and whom he did not intend to replace. The inconsistency of this statement refutes itself. But on Mr. B———D's dismissal more will be said hereafter. What has been observed is merely to shew that the sole *imputed* cause, was not the only cause—but that it was a general system of conduct repugnant to agreed principles, defined engagements, and positive instructions, which occasioned Lord F———M's removal. Lord F———M quotes from one of Mr. P———T's letters, that Mr. B———D's dismissal "was contrary to engagements;" and cites from another, that "Mr. P———T felt himself bound to adhere to those sentiments he had expressed before on the subject of arrangements, not only with regard to Mr. B———D, but to the line of conduct adopted in so many instances towards the former supporters of Government. By these sentiments, he must at all events be guided from a regard to the King's service, and to his own honor, however he may sincerely lament the consequences which must arise from the present situation."

Here let us pause. Lord F———M admits, that on coming to Ireland, he had consented to use every effort to keep the Catholic question back to a peace; he admits, that he came to adopt the same principle of union among parties which had

had taken place in England: His conduct was a continual violation of engagement on these two leading articles; and he was of course recalled. By stating the Cabinet correspondence, he has disclosed and admitted every thing that condemns, and nothing which justifies his conduct; and as we are not masters of the whole correspondence, but of such passages only as have been selected for the purpose of his vindication, we must be assured that he quoted those *alone* which were most favourable to his cause; and that if the most favourable passages cannot support his conduct, it is more than probable that the whole of the correspondence would have left him still more indefensible.

Lord F——M states, that the Duke of P——B, in his dispatch of the 21st of February, sums up all the reasons why his recall was deemed necessary by the Cabinet, without one dissenting voice for the very preservation of the Empire; but he does not state those reasons. It has been, however shewn, from his own Letters, that in the great points of the Catholic question, and of his dismissals, he acted against his instructions, and without authority; and that being desired to restrain himself within his instructions, he flatly and peremptorily disobeyed.

If after this marked defiance he had been continued, he would have established an Administration

tion independant of the King and the Cabinet ; the Executive Power would have been divided—there would have been two distinct Administrations—and the Irish Government would have been in the most pernicious situation possible, as Mr. G——N stated it—it would have been *deparmental*. His Lordship was therefore on the principle of his disobedience of orders, (which he not only admits but asserts), *necessarily* recalled for the preservation of the Empire.

His Lordship mixes his own vindication with the severest charges on the British Cabinet.—
 “ One short word (says his Lordship) more on
 “ this part of the subject—The dismissals :—
 “ when were those dismissals made, and an-
 “ nounced to the British Cabinet? Before the
 “ meeting of Parliament. When did their crimi-
 “ nality and the enormity of their offence first
 “ commence? It was when under the credit of
 “ my Administration, perhaps, derived from
 “ those very causes, the Parliament had submitted
 “ to unparralleled burdens, not solely for the
 “ purpose of providing for the internal security of
 “ the kingdom by the most ample and formidable
 “ military establishments, but likewise by lend-
 “ ing its assistance to the Empire at large in the
 “ hour of its greatest distress, by aids great and
 “ munificent beyond all example: Then com-
 “ menced the breach of all faith and agreements
 “ on my part, and not till then.”

Here

Here is an accusation of the most tremendous kind against his Majesty's Ministers, for having broken faith with the Irish nation, and for having duped and betrayed the Irish Parliament: Such an accusation is not, we must suppose, lightly made; it is built upon solid proof, not upon vague surmise; the truth of it is certain—at least it is probable; surely it cannot be impossible.

Let us examine his Lordship's arguments: On the 3d of February, Mr. G———N moved for a vote of 200,000l. for the purpose of manning the King's Navy; a vote merely equivalent to the supply given at the time of the affair of Nootka-Sound, and equal only to a 98th part of the British supply for the present year. On the 2d of February, Lord F———M states, that a letter was written by Mr. W———M, marking discontent at his conduct: and that on the 7th a final Cabinet was held, in which his conduct was totally disapproved. Now, by the course of the Mail it is certain, that the account of the vote of seamen could not have reached London until the 8th of February, and the letter marking discontent was written on the 2d; the Cabinet vote of disapprobation of Lord F———M passed on the 7th.—The general supply in Ireland was not stated to Parliament until the 9th of February, when 40,000 men, and a Loan of 1,500,000l. were voted unanimously; the date also of Mr. PITT's Letter, disapproving

Lord F———m's dismissal, is the identical 9th of February; so that to prove Lord F———m's assertion just, Mr. PITT must have known in London on the 9th of February, by a miraculous intuition, what was at the same moment passing in Ireland,

Thus does his Lordship endeavour (upon a suggestion which his own Letter proves to be physically impossible) to fix a stigma upon the British Cabinet, to raise a flame in the Irish Parliament, and to create resistance in the Irish Nation against His Majesty's Government. And his Lordship makes this charge at a time when, if he could prove it true against the British Cabinet, he must know it to be false, as it respects the Irish Parliament. For, to assert that the great supplies of the present year were voted in gratitude for his dismissal of the King's old Servants to favour his Lordship's relations; or that a Loan of 1,500,000*l.* was unanimously voted by a Protestant House of Commons, under the express stipulation that it should be Protestant no longer, is so preposterous, that it is hardly credible that the utmost blindness of passion should have adopted such an absurdity.

His Lordship states, that " he was charged with
 " the Government of a distracted, discontented
 " Country."—Alas! the distraction, the discontent
 were

were of his own making. Did his Lordship never hear or read of the unanimity of the last Session of Parliament? Did he never hear of the great and unanimous Supply which was then voted? Did he not know, that by the efforts of his Predecessor. Faction was nearly extinguished? That by the benign recommendation of the Crown, and liberality of the Parliament, the Catholics were in a state of satisfaction and content, from which nothing but the efforts of himself and his Partisans could have roused them? Did he not find his own estate flourishing, and without the smallest arrear of rent? Did not he find the Public Revenue rising in almost every article, so that its encrease this year has been a fifth over the former produce? and did not his Lordship in his speech from the Throne, remark with gratulation on this growth of Revenue, as well as on the flourishing state of Commerce and the increase of the Linen Manufacture beyond the most sanguine expectations? Did not he find a general zeal among the Gentlemen to exert themselves in the Militia and in the raising of Levies, and to display their loyalty on every occasion? And if his Lordship was sensible of these circumstances (of which he could not be ignorant) upon what pretence can he justify his libel on the kingdom, by terming unanimity discontent, and tranquility distraction, and thus attempting to destroy the reputation of his Predecessor, who had established those blessings?

Having

Having for his own vindication falsely accused the Ministry, and libelled his predecessor and the country, the next attack made by his Lordship is against himself; and in this he is as successful as in his others—he is unfortunate. It seems that Lord C——E had recommended to him a discreet and loyal conduct during his continuance in Ireland: to this his Lordship replies, “ that whatever it may cost his feelings, he shall not forget the duty he owes to his Majesty, or neglect the trust he has been graciously pleased to repose in him. A sense of his own honor, and what he owes to himself, will unite with what his country has a right to expect from him.—In imposing on himself this task he shall omit no personal sacrifice that may tend to the ease of his Majesty’s Government, or the advancement of his service, as far as depends on his influence during the short period of his retaining the authority with which he so lately condescended to invest him.”

Such are his Lordship’s sentiments of his duty: what was his conduct? the reverse of these sentiments. From the moment that his Lordship’s measures were finally disavowed, and his recall signified, the confidential agents of his Government were indefatigably at work to stir up discontent in every part of the kingdom; all his Lordship’s newspapers teemed with inflammatory statements and paragraphs; even his Prime Minister came forward

forward in language little short of treason ; and his Lordship himself finishes the climax with the most inflammatory appeal to the nation in the shape of a letter to a friend ; and at the moment of embarking from the kingdom, tosses from his Majesty's yacht a firebrand on shore to kindle the island. A few passages shall be quoted.

He states the instruction of the Cabinet for him to delay the Catholic question as " a desperate
" resolution to change the whole of their system,
" on a subject which they knew would involve
" in its decision the safety and existence of the
" kingdom ?"

In another his Lordship states, " that the putting
" off the Catholic question will be attended with a
" certainty of the most alarming and fatal consequences."

Again, he trusts " the evil Genius of England
" will not so far infatuate its Ministers as to induce them to wait for more decisive corroboration of his sentiments."

Again, " he refused to be the person to raise a flame in the country, which nothing short of arms could keep down."

And again, " rather than indulge me must the Ministers of England boldly face, I had almost said, the *certainty* of driving this kingdom into
a re-

“ a rebellion, and open another breach for ruin
“ and destruction to break in upon us.”

After the temperate addresses formed by his relations and friends, after the mild and discreet answer of his Prime Minister to the Catholics, such is the judicious and conciliating farewell of Lord F———M to the loyal people of Ireland !

When Sir L——— P———s brought forward a motion for a three-months Money Bill, and used unguarded language, nothing could be severer than the rebuke of Lord M———N.— He considered the motion and the language as a direct invitation to the common enemy ; and he stated, that such a measure would give more hopes to the French than any of their victories ; that it would counteract all the effect of their supplies ; and he represented, in the most passionate terms, the pernicious effect such language would have at Paris and in the National Convention, where it would be soon read.

If such was Lord M———’s censure of Sir L———E, who spoke as an individual, and without authority, what must be his condemnation of Lord F———M, who, from the seat of Government and on the Throne of deputed
Royalty,

Royalty, proclaims to Europe, that his recall will produce almost a certainty of rebellion?

Yet his Lordship may have formed an excuse for himself, which possibly he did not intend; "am I then" said he, "that light, weak and easy man, that
 "in matters of the highest import to the service
 "with which I have been entrusted, I should have
 "abandoned my judgment and committed my
 "decisions to others without consulting my own
 "understanding?"

May not this defence be in some degree accepted? Does it not bear an appearance of truth? Does it not coincide with every circumstance of his Lordship's Government?—If, instead of delaying the Catholic question according to his instructions, he manifestly urged it forwards; if instead of making a coalition of parties, he dismissed many of the King's old servants, in order to establish the power and party of his cousins; if he brought accusations against the British Cabinet, which he proved to be physically impossible; if he concluded his administration with a statement the most false and inflammatory, at the very moment that he was declaring he would omit no sacrifice that might tend to the ease of his Majesty's Government, and the advancement of his service; if this was his Lordship's conduct, and if thus his Lordship proves, that his measures are contrary to his in-

D

structions,

structions, his accusations to his proofs, and the expressions of his passion to his sense of duty, let the vindication he has offered be accepted; let us allow him to "have abandoned his judgment," to have "committed his decisions to others;" and never to "have consulted his own understanding?"—It is a poor apology—but it is the only one,

Let us now advert to Lord F———m's statement of the "real cause of his recall, viz. Mr. PITT's design, at the time of the coalition, not to strengthen Administration by an accession of character, but to debase, degrade and disgrace that character."

Not being able to divine the undeclared intentions of any man, except by presumption from exterior acts and circumstances, and having no materials for judgment in the case before us, but his Lordship's Letters, to these we must advert to discover if possible Mr. PITT's intentions and his own.

Lord F———m and his friends being obliged to secede from their old leader, Mr. Fox, on account of his sentiments respecting French principles and policy, declared in favour of the War, which they thought absolutely necessary for the very salvation of Great Britain, and they warmly supported

supported it: Mr. PITT receiving the benefit of that support, seems to have conceived himself bound in honour to mark his sense of it: and he offered a fair participation of power, emolument and direction, which was accepted.

The mere principle of coalition taken abstractedly, certainly evinced a friendly intention on both sides.

As to the management of the War being continued to Mr. D——s, since the Duke of P——r L——d does not complain, in his Lordship's courtly strain, that he has been "cabbaged," we must conceive he was satisfied on the subject, and that he adopted the arrangement as necessary and honourable.

With respect to Ireland, his Lordship states that
 " if the general management and superintendance
 " of this kingdom had not been offered to his
 " Grace, the coalition would not have taken
 " place; and that it was accordingly offered from
 " the beginning of the negotiation; that the Duke
 " accepted the management of Ireland without
 " any restrictions whatever, and that his Grace
 " pressed it upon his Lordship without any."

An offer so fair, so honourable, was not surely intended to debase the coalition: It however requires to be explained and appreciated.

Mr. PITT had been Minister for eleven years : his administration had been generally successful in Ireland ; party had indeed broken forth at the Regency, but measures of conciliation had lately been adopted to heal the differences of that period ; liberal indulgences had contented the Catholics ; constitutional concessions had united the Parliament ; no party demand (except some arrangement of the Dublin Police which had been repeatedly offered by Government,) remained unsatisfied ; all the friends of the Duke of P———D could have accepted office, consistently with their character and honour, and there was a cordial disposition to embrace them, so far as it could be done, without an injurious sacrifice of his Majesty's old servants.

The department of Ireland is managed as follows :—The Official Correspondence with the Lord Lieutenant is conducted by the Secretary of State for the home department ; measures affecting the Treasury, Revenue and Civil List, (which comprehends much of the patronage,) except in specified cases, are managed by the First Lord of the Treasury ; questions of general policy and Imperial import are determinable in the Cabinet.

When therefore Mr. P———T offered the department of Ireland (if he did so) to the Duke of P———D, it should seem that he offered to second the Duke of P———D's recommendation
to

to the KING of a successor to Lord W———D, and that he held out to that successor the promise of a fair support.

What must have been the Duke of P———D's construction of this offer? His Grace had agreed to a coalition on the principle of mutual oblivion of all former differences and animosities, and on the necessity of an union of all descriptions for the very preservation of the Constitution and the Empire. He of course felt that the same principle was to be extended to Ireland. For if a fair principle of coalition was to be the rule in England, whilst exclusive party was to be played in Ireland, his Grace knew that an impression would have been made destructive to Mr. P———T's character as a Minister and a Gentleman; and his Grace must have felt indignantly averse from any such idea.

If Mr. P———T, as was industriously insinuated by party runners in Ireland, had consented to sacrifice the KING's old Supporters and his own personal adherents, in order to purchase additional support to the War, he was a ruined Minister; for no man could thereafter trust a person capable of such ingratitude and duplicity: Mr. PITT could not therefore have made an offer, which directly led to his own degradation and disgrace; the Duke of P———D could never have construed the
offer

offer in a light which must have ruined the person who made it; and if Mr. P——T had made this sacrifice of his character in direct and positive terms, his Grace would have refused to coalesce with a Minister who, at the moment of negotiation, shewed himself unworthy of confidence.

“ The department of Ireland was offered without restriction.”——Be it so.——Mr. PITT naturally thought that the less stipulation he made with men of high character and honour, the more his own honour was secure. He knew that the general principles of the coalition being understood, it could not be construed, like the Navigation act, differently on different sides of the Channel, and be interpreted to mean union in England and exclusion in Ireland; Mr. P——T knew that there was a precedent of a coalition when Lord NORTHINGTON was Lord Lieutenant, and the Duke of P——D Prime Minister; and that the principle of it was then understood in Ireland, and honourably acted upon by his Grace; and he was convinced his Grace would act with the same honour to him as he had himself acted to Lord GUILFORD. Mr. P——T disdained therefore the narrow policy of precise agreement, because from the very nature of an union between high characters, after a long series of animosity, their feelings rise to a scrupulous delicacy and punctilio, and they become of course
more

more tender of each others adherents than of their own friends.

What could then have produced any jealousy and misunderstanding? Lord F———m's Irish Friends being more anxious for power and patronage than for Mr. P—r's or his Lordship's honor, chose to construe the offer (as it was made without restriction) to be an assignment of the Government in fee simple to themselves. They refuse to engage with his Lordship but upon their own terms; and as a preliminary, insist upon the dismissal of the C———r. This extraordinary proposal being opened to Mr. P—r, it appears "that delay interposed, and some doubts and difficulties arose;" and very naturally. It must have struck Mr. P—r, that being demanded to give up the most able of the KING's supporters in Ireland, the most steady friend to the connexion of the two kingdoms, a Nobleman whom he himself had recommended to the KING for the Seals, on account of his zealous adherence and tried loyalty on a critical occasion, was rather too serious an attack on his personal honor and the KING's interests. He accordingly resisted, and the settlement of the Irish Government was in abeyance, until Lord S———r returned from Vienna, who had been a party to the coalition. On his arrival, the removal of the C———r was given up by Lord F———m's Friends, and the principle

ciple of "pursuing that line of conduct by which
 "the full advantage of the Union which had taken
 "place in England might be extended to Ireland,"
 was brought forward and ratified.

Notwithstanding however the adoption of this principle of Union, Lord F———M thinks himself warranted, on his arrival in Ireland, to dismiss as many of the KING's Servants as may be sufficient to satisfy the first objects of his relations; to treat some of them with pointed hostility, and to form a Party Government on the most contracted basis, to the exclusion of almost all the KING's old Servants.

Let us review this statement. Mr. PITT, by offering the Department of Ireland, without restriction, paid the highest compliment to his new friends, by placing the guardianship of the KING's interests, and his own honor, in their hands.—How does Lord F———M manage the trust?—Knowing that if Mr. PITT abandoned his Irish friends he was a ruined man, his Lordship proposes the sacrifice of the chief of them, and being opposed, takes the first occasion of sacrificing others by wholesale, and establishing a party system.

Here then we see every presumptive circumstance to make us conclude that Mr. PITT had honourable designs towards Lord F———M,
 whilst

whilst his Lordship's determination to "degrade, "debase and disgrace" Mr. PITT is demonstrated by himself to conviction.

But what could have induced his Lordship to mention the placing of Lord SPENCER at the head of the Admiralty? for this arrangement was no part of the coalition: yet it is the strongest proof that could be possibly adduced of Mr. PITT's sincerity towards his new friends, and of his cordial determination to support the principle of Union by every mark of confidence and regard.—If Mr. PITT meant to degrade and debase the character of his new Allies in the Cabinet, would he have made Lord MANSFIELD President of the Council; would he have induced his brother to retire from the Admiralty; and would he have conferred upon Lord SPENCER a department so high in its responsibility, and so powerful in its patronage?

His Lordship concludes, that "he has the glory "of being objectionable to Mr. PITT—and he "feels it such." Was it then wise to demonstrate from his own letter, that by attacking the KING's servants in Ireland, by removing Mr. PITT's friends, by introducing a new party system, his Lordship was the first to desert every principle of the Coalition; and that Mr. PITT, by conferring new honours and additional power on
E those

those with whom he has united, has proved his consistency and steadiness?

If, indeed, Lord F———M had evinced that he had fulfilled the principles of Union and Coalition, and that Mr. PITT had deserted them, he might have occasion to glory: but if he alone abandoned those principles whilst Mr. PITT upheld them—his Lordship has no refuge but shame.

But Lord F———M says, “ It is a matter of public notoriety in this country, that Mr. PITT assured Lord W———L——D as early as August, that he should not be removed; and I know that I could bring evidence to prove, that in the course of the Autumn he pointed out my actual successor as the person to succeed my predecessor.” This seems an imputation of duplicity on Mr. PITT, but it was also notorious that at the period alluded to, the arrangement of Ireland was at a stand, on account of Lord F———Z———W———M’s insisting on the dismissal of the C———R; was it not therefore natural that Mr. PITT should privately take measures with his confidential friends, in case upon Lord S———R’s return, an arrangement with Lord F———Z———W———M on the principles of the coalition could not be affected? It is no mark of insincerity,
pending

pending a negotiation, to make provisions for security in case of its failure.

Having thus shortly observed on the leading points of Lord F———m's letters, we may now subjoin a few detached remarks.

Upon the dismissal of Mr. B———d, his Lordship first objects to his power: He afterwards finds him loaded with suspicions, and charges him with malversation. How then does his Lordship act? He removes him from his office, and leaves him his emoluments, and thus compromises public criminality. If his Lordship knew that Mr. B———d was really criminal, he should have dismissed him entirely, and upon *that* principle: If his Lordship had no ground to act upon but suspicion, it became him to have stated in a manly way to Mr. B———d the imputations against him, and to have brought those imputations to examination and trial. If Mr. B———d had then appeared criminal, the fairness of Lord F———m's conduct would have been applauded; but if innocent, his Lordship would have seen through the endeavours to impose on his judgment, and he would have no longer been misled by party instigations.

But the fact is, that Lord F———m was entirely in the hands of his connections, and Mr.

B——d's situation was deemed incompatible with the P——y's plan of power. In the honest openness of the table, it was avowed that a great regard was entertained for Mr. B——d; that he had been always found a man of honour, but that if he remained at the Revenue Board, another person could not have the power of the country.— This is the whole secret of Mr. B——d's removal; for even after his dismissal, an offer of connexion and alliance in politics was made, and when it was rejected the attack commenced upon his character. Mr. B——d will smile at this attack, as an upright servant of the King, and a faithful manager of the Revenue; and if the influence of his connexions may be thought to stand in the way of Lord F——m's relations, he knows *that* influence was never exerted to the embarrassment of any administration, nor ever felt by any Lord Lieutenant who made the interests of his Majesty, and not the interests of his relations, the rule of his Government.

There is one part of Lord F——m's conduct as to the Catholic Question still more inexcusable than the rest. On the 14th of February he received a dispatch from the D——E of P——D, pressing him by the strongest motives and arguments and motives, which could possibly be induced, to delay the Catholic measure; and also a letter from Mr. PITT, disapproving his dismissals:

to

to these he returns a letter of defiance to Mr. PITT, and of direct refusal on the Catholic point to his Grace. His Lordship, of course, made up his mind for being recalled, and as in that event, he was assured that the Catholic Bill could not be agreed to this Session, it was surely his duty not to encourage, but to check the hopes of the Catholics, and to soften as much as possible the probability of a disappointment which he himself had occasioned. Instead, however, of this healing conduct, his Answers to the Catholic Addressees, from this very period to the 14th of February, when he was conscious their wishes could not be conceded, are calculated to keep alive in their minds that certainty of success which his former Answers had inspired; and in particular, his Lordship encourages the Catholics of Westmeath on the 19th of February on the following terms: " They will find me not unmindful of the confidence they repose in me. As far as depends upon my co-operation with the wisdom and liberality of the Legislature, I shall neither frustrate their hopes nor disappoint their expectations."

It is difficult to comment upon this answer with coolness, which keeps the word of promise to the ear, and breaks it to their hopes:—It was calculated to mislead, to disappoint, to inflame; and the
motive

motive of the Answer can neither be concealed nor excused—*for it is literally true.*

Lord F———M states from a private dispatch of the Duke of P——D, that his putting off the Catholic question “ would be the means of doing a “ greater service to the British empire than it has “ been capable of receiving since the Revolution— “ at least since the Union.”—What must have been his Lordship’s motives, when he thus publishes an extract from a confidential dispatch which may lead suspicious minds to conjecture that a Union is projected by the British Cabinet? Whether such a project be a fact or not, whether it be wise or ruinous is not now discussed, but what was the motive

—————“ Spargere voces
In vulgum ambiguas & querere conficius arma?”

Was it not to light up a new principle of contest—to start a new game for Opposition, and to embarrass with additional difficulties the KING’s service? And with what sincerity then does his Lordship style himself “ a steadfast adherent to the unity of both nations?”

An Union seems to be the alternative in case of a design to separate from Great Britain, or of a general attack upon property: If either of these should happen, an Union *must* come into discussion

on; but except in cases of such extremity, it is highly improbable that either the British or Irish Parliament would listen to the proposal, for it is evidently against the interest of both. This speculation, however, does not seem to be the real cause for which the British Ministry wish to postpone the Catholic question.—It will be considered that the demands of the Catholics go to the repeal of all the restrictive laws whatsoever; it will occur that an authority from the British Parliament for the Chancellor of England to put the Great Seal to a Bill for that purpose may be necessary; it will be recollected, that so strong is the zeal for the Protestant Establishment in Great Britain, that the Minister has not dared to propose for the English Catholics the same Indulgencies which the Irish have received; it will not be forgotten what were the tumults and insurrections in Scotland, when an idea of relieving the Scotch Catholics was brought forward; and no man but remembers the horrors of 1780, at the most distressing period of a disastrous war, when on account of very moderate indulgencies being proposed in favour of the Catholics of England, an enthusiastic madman was able to collect 200,000 incendiaries, was nearly destroying London in a general conflagration, and involving the empire in total ruin.

How then could the British Minister hazard to bring forward the whole of the Catholic subject
before

before the British Parliament in a time of such complicated difficulty as the present, to go at large into the principle and history of the penal laws, the former and the present policy on that subject? How could he venture to entrench upon the great securities established for the Protestant Religion at the times of the Revolution and the Union? How could he venture to propose at such a crisis a new system of ecclesiastical principles, so nearly allied with the Republican and French system of considering all distinctions on account of religion as absurd, and of abolishing all religious tests whatsoever?

A Minister must have hardy nerves, who, without the most cogent and overpowering necessity, should take up such a question in a time of the most profound tranquility; but to spring a subject so intimately connected with all the dangerous prejudices of the human heart, and so closely allied with the essence of the Constitution, and fraught with consequences which no man can foresee or calculate in a time of such multifarious embarrassment would betray a conduct little short of insanity.

What are the Catholic demands? A repeal of all the remaining restrictive laws whatever by which they are affected. All the reserved offices of leading power in the state are to be opened to them

them; the great Corporations are in a few years to be subjected to their Government, at a time when the lower classes are plundering the Protestants of their arms, they are to be invested with a power and right to keep them; the support and repair of Protestant churches are to be subjected to Catholic votes; the Legislature is to be made accessible to their present influence, and future possible superiority; and the act of supremacy and act of uniformity are either to be repealed or new modelled.—Such is the real avowed demand of the Catholics, attended with a general resolution of their representative body, for a radical reform of Parliament, enforced by seditious speeches at their meetings. If then these demands are to be gratified, and we are told that nothing short of complete concession will give content, can any man assert that the admission of them has not a tendency to transfer the power of the Country, and to endanger the Protestant Establishment?

And if measures are thus proposed which have a tendency to endanger the Protestant Establishment, is there any constitutional man who knows any thing of the principles and history of that Constitution, who has read the Declaration of Rights, the Act of Settlement, the Act of Union, who knows the Irish Revolution of 1782, and the oaths and duties imposed on the Crown; is there any such

man who will assert, that the Ministers could advise the KING to order the Great Seal of England to be put to a bill for taking away the securities of the Protestant Church and Government of Ireland, without stating the subject previously to the Parliament of Great Britain, and obtaining a Parliamentary authority for such a measure?

It is no wonder then that the principles of delay should be inculcated; and that when Lord F——z w——m pleaded its difficulty, that the British Cabinet should enforce it by every means in their power; and that when his Lordship refused to comply with their instructions, so warmly and cogently repeated, that they should, however reluctantly, recall him. Were not these considerations of sufficient force to make delay advisable? and was it necessary for his Lordship to insinuate, that the project of an *union alone*, and not the reasons that have been stated, were the motives for adjourning to a time of tranquillity, what could not with safety be debated in times of danger?

His Lordship says, that except the Catholic question and supplies, the only measure he had attempted was "the arrangement of the Treasury Board," which he states was fully agreed upon by Sir J——N P——LL and Mr. P——T. If this is the fact, and if Sir J——N P——LL did
arrange

arrange their Treasury business with Mr. P——r, why was the introduction of it consigned to Mr. FORBES? the business belonged to the Department of the C———r of the E———r; and if the Government of both kingdoms concurred in it, and there was merit in the measure, why was that merit transferred to Mr. F——s, and Lord M——n publicly degraded by accepting it as a legacy from his hands? Was not this a part of the plan to erect Irish party on the ruin of Irish Government, and to take every credit and influence away from the Crown, and place them in popular advisers?

But enough has been said to refute Lord F——z w——m's attack on the Cabinet for his removal, which his Lordship has so amply proved to be necessary and unavoidable. There is no occasion to remark on the general coarseness and incorrectness of his language, on his flattering description of his friend the Duke of P———d, or the numerous passages which prove that he was a mere instrument of party. We cannot, however, resist expressing sincere concern, that a character in private life so highly esteemed, should have been so much misguided, and should have been suffered to inflame the errors of prejudice by the indiscretions of passion.

F I N I S.



APPENDIX.

CATHOLICS OF DUBLIN.

AT a numerous and respectable Meeting of the Catholics of the City of Dublin, held at the Star and Garter, in Essex-street, on Tuesday, Dec. the 23d, 1794,

EDWARD BYRNE, Esq; in the Chair,

Mr. RICHARD M'CORMICK having been requested to act as Secretary to the Meeting, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to, and ordered to be published :

RESOLVED unanimously, That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that an humble Application be made to Parliament, in the ensuing Session, praying for a TOTAL REPEAL of the PENAL and RESTRICTIVE LAWS, still affecting the Catholics of Ireland.

Resolved unanimously, That a Committee of NINE be appointed to prepare a Petition to that effect, and report the same to this Meeting forthwith; and the following Gentlemen were named on said Committee :

Mr. Byrne
Mr. Braughall
Mr. Sweetman
Mr. M'Cormick
Dr. Ryan

Mr. M'Donnell
Dr. M'Nevan
Mr. Hamill
Mr. Keogh.

And

And the said Gentlemen having reported, and the Petition so prepared being read over, Paragraph by Paragraph, and agreed to, it was——

Resolved unanimously, That we do recommend said Petition to be adopted as the Petition of the Catholics of the City of Dublin.

Resolved unanimously, That we do most earnestly recommend to the Catholics of Ireland, to prepare and transmit similar Petitions; and that, in order thereto, the Gentlemen above named be instructed to take the most speedy and effectual Steps for circulating Copies of this Day's proceedings through the different Counties and great Cities throughout the Kingdom, and also through the several Parishes of the City of Dublin; for the Purpose of ensuring that Unanimity and Co-operation which has been hitherto found so beneficial to the Catholic Interest.

Resolved unanimously, That the Right Hon. HENRY GRATTAN be requested to present the Petition of the Catholics of Dublin to the House of Commons on the approaching Meeting of Parliament.

Resolved unanimously, That the above Committee do prepare an Address of Congratulation, to be presented to his Excellency Earl FITZWILLIAM, on his arrival in this kingdom.

And the said Gentlemen having prepared an Address, and reported accordingly, it was——

Resolved unanimously, That said Address do stand as the Address of the Catholics of the City of Dublin, and be presented accordingly, on his Excellency's arrival.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this meeting be presented to EDWARD BYRNE, Esq; for the zeal, spirit, and activity, which on this, as on all former occasions, he has manifested in the cause of the Catholics of Ireland.

Signed, by order of the meeting,

RICHARD M'CORMICK, Sec.

The following Address was presented to his Excellency the LORD LIEUTENANT, by a numerous body of ROMAN CATHOLICS, who went in procession from the Rotunda to the Castle.

" May it please your Excellency,

WE, his Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Catholics of the City of Dublin, beg leave to approach your Excellency with our most sincere and heart-felt congratulation on your appointment to the high and important office of Lord Lieutenant of this kingdom.—We entreat your Excellency to believe, that it is with more than ordinary gratitude we receive this additional proof of the paternal goodness of our most gracious Sovereign, in deputing a Nobleman, who from his character, situation, and talents, his intimate connexions with, and extensive property in this country, we entertain the most founded hopes, will strenuously and successfully promote the interests of Ireland—and our gratification is still heightened by the strong impression we feel that those men will stand foremost in your Excellency's confidence, who have on all great occasions appeared the most powerful supporters of the interests of their country—and to whose exertions the Catholics of Ireland are so peculiarly indebted.

Relieved, as we have been recently, from the pressure of many severe and degrading incapacities—we hope to manifest to your Excellency, that our gratitude is commensurate with the benefits we have received, of the value and extent of which we are deeply sensible—and we can with confidence, assert, that when it shall seem good to the Legislature to remove those disabilities which yet remain, our demeanor will be that of men worthy of receiving complete relief from a gracious and beneficent Monarch, and a liberal and enlightened Legislature.

" We

" We entreat your Excellency to receive our sincere profession of loyalty to our Sovereign, to whose paternal recommendation we feel so much indebted—and of inviolable attachment to the principles of our most excellent Constitution, into whose bosom it is our utmost ambition to be admitted ; and, we trust that to your Excellency's Administration is reserved the glory of completing the benevolent wish of the Father of his People, for the union of all his subjects in sentiment, interest and affection, by an abolition of all partial restrictions, founded only on religious distinctions ;—thereby insuring security and protection to the Catholics, and strength, honour, and prosperity to Ireland."

To which his Excellency was pleased to reply :

" Gentlemen,

" I return you thanks for this Address. The spirit of loyalty which it breathes towards his Majesty's Person and Government, the attachment which it evinces to our happy Constitution, the approbation of my principles and of my past conduct, which it conveys, and the confidence which it professes to repose in my dispositions, to employ the great trust his Majesty has placed in my hands, in promoting the welfare and happiness of this kingdom, cannot but afford me singular satisfaction.

" From the submissive and peaceable conduct of the Catholics of Ireland, under the pressure of restrictions, which considerations of temporary policy, and circumstances peculiar to unhappy periods of civil dissention had imposed, there is every reason, at this day, to rely on them for a firm fidelity and cordial allegiance. The language you now hold confirms this reasonable expectation ; while the gratitude you express to our beloved Sovereign for his paternal care, to which you so loyally and justly ascribe the first openings of
your

your emancipation, and the sentiments you entertain of the magnanimity of a liberal and enlightened Parliament, that rose superior to the prejudices of ages, and displayed a cordial disposition to cease to discriminate between his Majesty's subjects, when every motive to that discrimination had ceased, must be highly satisfactory to every description of your fellow-subjects. Such declarations, while they bear so visible a stamp of sincerity and truth, as your address discovers, must afford a pleasing earnest of the happy consequences that necessarily follow from mutual confidence and reciprocal trust among the inhabitants of the same empire, and manifest the wisdom of the measure that has led the way to that unity of sentiment and interest, on which, as on their only solid basis, the strength and prosperity of nations rest.

“ In the faithful discharge of my duty to his Majesty, it shall be my study to call to my Councils those who are distinguished and known for their wisdom, their integrity, and their talents—and who possess the confidence of his Majesty's People. Assisted by their advice, and availing myself of their support, I trust that I shall be enabled to promote the first wishes of his Majesty's heart, by securing the full and cordial union of all his subjects, as the surest means of securing their happiness. On your parts I shall rely for corresponding sentiments, and that you will evince, by more than professions, that you are determined to make common cause with a brave, loyal, and free People, in opposing all the enemies of his Majesty's Person and Government, in guarding against all encroachments on our excellent Constitution, and in preserving the internal peace and tranquility of your country.”

On Thursday, February the 19th. Lieutenant Colonel O'Reilly, the Right Rev. Dr. Plunkett, and Lieut. Col. Doyle, waited on his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, at the Castle, with the following Address from the Catholics of the County of WESTMEATH:

To his Excellency, WM. Earl FITZWILLIAM, Lord Lieut. General, and General Governor of Ireland.

May it please your Excellency

WE, his Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the Catholics of the county Westmeath, at all times sensible of the benevolent disposition of our beloved Sovereign towards his Catholic subjects of Ireland, feel our gratitude (if possible) increased by the recent mark which he has been graciously pleased to give us, in common with our fellow subjects, of his paternal care and attention for our welfare, by appointing your Excellency to the government of this kingdom. It is from a Nobleman of your Excellency's disposition and liberal feelings, who imitates the virtues, as he represents the character of our revered Sovereign, who like him wishes to unite, and make completely happy all descriptions of people—and whose good sense will direct him to accomplish the end, which his benevolence suggests, that we look up with confidence for measures that will insure permanent happiness to our country. We feel too strongly the blessings of being governed by the best of Princes, and the benefits arising from our excellent Constitution, not to entertain sentiments of the most ardent loyalty to the person and family of the one, and devoted attachment to the principles of the other.

We have long seen with admiration the many and great advantages derived by our sister kingdom, from the strict obedience and great respect there paid to the laws—we are therefore determined to use our best endeavours and utmost exertions to promote the same in this country, and will at all times, (when called upon) cheerfully stand forward to co-operate with your Excellency's government, in rendering effectual such measures as the wisdom of Parliament

Parliament may direct for supporting our happy Constitution, and preserving the peace and good order of the country.

We beg leave to assure your Excellency, that our declarations (which are dictated by our hearts) are sincere and unqualified. Our reliance on your Excellency's wisdom, integrity, and liberality is implicit. We have not the most distant idea of suggesting terms; but we should consider ourselves as wanting to our feelings, did we not express to your Excellency a confident hope that should the Legislature in its wisdom, enable us to enjoy the full advantages of our Constitution, in common with all our fellow subjects, we should not be found unworthy of so generous a mark of its confidence and liberality.

PATRICK DOWDALL, Sec.

To which his Excellency was pleased to return the following Answer.

GENTLEMEN,

I CANNOT too often express the entire satisfaction I feel at the repeated proofs, which I daily receive of the loyalty and zeal of his Majesty's Catholic subjects of Ireland.—I beg you to assure the Gentlemen who have deputed you to present this Address, that I am equally thankful to them as to the other bodies of their brethren, who have already come forward with similar professions.

They will find me not unmindful of the confidence they repose in me. As far as depends on my co-operation with the wisdom and liberality of the Legislature, I shall neither frustrate their hopes, nor disappoint their expectations.

C O P Y
OF THE
O A T H
TAKEN BY
LORD FITZW————M,
AS A
PRIVY-COUNS————OR.

YOU shall swear to be a true and faithful servant unto the King's Majesty, as one of his Majesty's Privy Council. You shall not know, or understand of any manner of Thing to be attempted done, or spoken, against his Majesty's Person, Honour, Crown or Dignity Royal, but you shall lett and withstand the same to the uttermost of your Power, and either cause it to be revealed to his Majesty himself, or to such of the Privy Council, as shall advertise his Majesty of the same. You shall in all things to be moved treated and debated in Council, faithfully and truly declare your mind and opinion according to your Heart and Conscience, and shall keep secret all matters committed and revealed unto you, or that shall be treated of secretly in Council, and if any of the said Treaties or Councils shall touch any of the Counsellors you shall not reveal it unto him, but shall keep the same until such time as by the Consent of his Majesty, or of the Concil publication shall be made

made thereof. You shall to your uttermost bear Faith and Allegiance unto the King's Majesty,—“ *And shall assist and defend all Jurisdictions, Preheminences and Authorities, granted to his Majesty and annexed to the Crown by Act of Parliament, or otherwise, against all foreign Princes, Persons, Prelates, States, and Potentates.*” And generally in all things you shall do as a faithful and true servant ought to do to his Majesty, So help you God, and the holy contents of this Book.

N. B.—The part of the Oath printed in Italics, was erased by James the second, and was restored at the Revolution by William the III^d.

